



Stakeholder Committee Meeting
December 9, 2010, 6:30 pm
Hazel Harvey Peace Center

AGENDA

1. Introductions/Overview (10 min)
2. Review of Stakeholder Meeting #1 (20 min)
3. Discussion of Project Performance Evaluations (10 min)
4. Review of Programs in Other Communities (10 min)
5. Workshop – Community Acceptability (45 min)
6. Open Discussion/Schedule (25 min)



STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE MEETING #2

Thursday, December 9, 2010, 6:30 – 8:30 pm
Hazel Harvey Peace Center

MINUTES

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was opened by Don McChesney, Engineering Manager of Transportation Public Works. Mr. McChesney introduced staff and project consultants.

Stakeholder committee members present include:

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| – Lynna K. Fulton | – Joe Self* |
| – Gloria Thompson | – Judy Williams |
| – Sergio Yanes | – Juliet George |
| – Libby Willis | – Paula Monthie |
| – Jennifer Moody | |

(*New stakeholder committee member, Forest Park Berry watershed)

Audience Members present:

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|
| – Mitch Monthie | – Dave & Miriam Hermann |
| – Christina Patosri | – Michelle Thomason |
| – Peter Thompson | – Brenda Gasperich |

City of Fort Worth Staff Members

- Don McChesney, Engineering Manager, TPW
- Steve Eubanks, Senior Professional Engineer, TPW
- Linda Young, Senior Professional Engineer, TPW
- Eric Fladager, Planning Manager
- Linda Sterne, Communications Officer/Public Information
- Regis Andres, Neighborhood Education Specialist, Planning & Development
- Greg Simmons, Assistant Director, TPW

FOS Consultant Team Members Present

- Burton Johnson, P.E., Project Manager, Michael Baker Jr., Corp.
- Pam Roach, President, Pam Roach Public Relations
- Mark Bowers, Group Vice President, HOK Planning

Watershed Consultants Present

- Zubin Sukheswalla, PE, CFM, Project Manager, AECOM

OVERVIEW & REVIEW OF STAKEHOLDER MEETING #1 (OCT 28, 2010)

Mr. McChesney turned meeting over to Burton Johnson, Feasible Options Study project manager. Mr. Johnson restated the project's goals, objectives and constraints, and then presented an overview of the various types of flood mitigation options the committee discussed last time. The overview included the advantages and disadvantages of each option (For details, see minutes from previous stakeholder meeting, Oct 28, 2010).

REVIEW OF OTHER CITIES

The consulting team will bring back reports of how cities such as Houston, Dallas, San Antonio and Seattle dealt with similar issues. The report will be presented at the next stakeholder meeting. Committee members would like to receive advance copies of the report prior to meeting.

WORKSHOP PRESENTATION

Schematics were displayed which involved various hypothetical flood scenarios in random residential neighborhoods. The primary issue discussed relative to potential solutions involved the acceptability of acquiring flood-prone properties and seeking to use these areas to store storm water run-off. Mr. Johnson described how such areas could be ecologically-friendly and attractive community amenities that add value to the neighborhood vs. inadequately maintained vacant lots.

Several stakeholders stated emphatically that any option which involved the acquisition of property was completely unacceptable to them. Others present were somewhat receptive to the possibility of some property acquisition to help reduce the risk of flooding, especially with respect to the acquisition of properties which chronically flood and become a drag on home values in the neighborhood.

The following is a categorical summary of the general thrust of the comments made by the committee and other attendees at the meeting:

1. Opposition to property acquisitions

- Stakeholder Committee members whose homes do not flood at all are opposed to any property acquisitions and only want to discuss possible solutions that involve no property acquisitions.
 - An audience member said that any option which includes removal or purchase of homes to reduce flooding will not be accepted by the general public because they don't want their neighborhoods torn up. She said that this option would more likely be accepted primarily by those who flood. The question was asked: why doesn't the planning team remove the buying of homes off the table altogether and come back with short-term mitigation solutions that aren't so disruptive and destabilizing to neighborhoods?

2. Historic Property

- A number of committee members expressed serious concern about and objection to any solution that might negatively impact historic neighborhoods. Mr. Johnson said that any feasible options selected must be acceptable to, and may not devalue, the community.
- Ms. Libby Willis commented that she was pleased to see the new book of fellow stakeholder committee member and author, Ms. Juliet George, "Fort Worth Arlington Heights", which depicts historic properties located in the CAH watershed. Although these historic properties

City of Fort Worth Storm Water Management

Feasible Options Study

Public Involvement Process

do not experience flooding they are surrounded by neighboring streets which do. Ms. Willis further stated that said that the *Tarrant County Historic Resources Survey* also includes historic properties from both CAH and FPB watersheds. Steve Eubanks, TPW's Senior Professional Engineer, will obtain a copy for city staff to review.

- Mr. Johnson stated that while the preservation of historic property is important, the stakeholder committee is being asked to take a broader view of the many challenges facing both watersheds. Mr. Johnson said that efforts to address flooding in both watersheds will help the City to review larger issues citywide. The stakeholder committee's role is to help identify a way to assess the benefit a project provides from a community-wide perspective.

3. Willing to consider limited property acquisitions

- Some stakeholders who do flood would like to keep the option of removing homes (in troubled spots) as a viable option because of the blight caused by repeat flood damage. Many of these properties are either unoccupied or are occupied by renters who don't value living in their neighborhood.

4. Other comments on property acquisition

- Why doesn't the planning team survey the 61 homeowners that flood to gauge whether they would be open to selling their homes to make way for solutions.

5. Comparison with other Communities

- Stakeholders asked for a report on what other communities are doing so we can see what might work for our neighborhoods.
- Send an advance copy to stakeholder committee before next meeting.

6. Key Data

- Stakeholders asked for key data (e.g. # of homes affected, cost of project, level of flooding) on the problems and potential alternative solutions.

7. Design Criteria

- Stakeholders asked to see what the cost of solutions would be if the design criteria were lowered from the 75-yr, 50-yr, 25-yr, etc?

8. Special district

- Stakeholders inquired about the possibility of the city creating a redevelopment overlay district in the watershed to protect the area from projects with excessive amounts of impervious surfaces. If this city policy already exists, can it create more restrictive policies?

9. Suggestions for drainage improvements

- Stakeholders asked:
 - Why we don't just focus the projects on Western and Carleton where the worst flooding has occurred?
 - Have we considered using underground detention, french drains in alleys, routing the runoff down the middle of the street like is done sometimes on driveways, and/or using stilts to raise homes up off the ground?

10. Eminent Domain

- Ms. Willis said she attended a meeting recently where a lobbyist read from 5 pages of information that suggested cities may have problems in the future enacting eminent domain. The impression she received was that there are impending changes in legislation which will make it harder for cities to use this type of option to acquire property.

ACTION ITEMS FOR NEXT STAKEHOLDER MEETING

- The consultants will bring back:
 - a. A report with metrics of bottom line costs which outline inventory of homes in flood-prone areas, the number of homes that need to be fixed, cost to fix, and the reduction in flooding produced as a result.
 - b. A report on other cities.
 - c. A report on potential for some sort of special zoning to ensure that any future development in these areas improves the drainage situation.

The next Stakeholder Committee meeting is planned for late January or early February.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:38pm.